920476-94915

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE THE APPLICATION OF : Examiner:

Robin Rickard Li Liu

SERIAL NO.: 10/679,824 : Art Unit: 2613

FILED: October 6, 2003 : Customer No: 23644

FOR: Optical Sub-Carrier Multiplexed : Confirmation No.: 3707

RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR ELECTION DATED NOVEMBER 29, 2007

Honorable Director of Patents and Trademarks P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Election Requirement issued by the Examiner on November 29, 2007, the applicants provisionally elect species 1 comprising Figs. 2, 4 and 6, but with traverse. The claims readable on this specie are Claims 1-16, 20-32 and 34. The reasons for the traverse are as follows:

In this application:

Figure 1 shows the complete method of the invention. Figure 8 shows the transmitting part of the method in more detail and Figure 9 shows the receiving part of the method in more detail.

Figure 2 shows a first implementation of transmitter for carrying out the method of the invention, and Figure 3 is a second implementation which operates according to the same principles (see page 23, line 10) and is essentially multiple apparatus of Figure 2 in parallel and with electrical amplitude modulation.

Figure 4 shows schematically a first implementation of receiver for carrying out the method of the invention (Figure 6 shows this version in more detail), and Figure 5 is a second implementation of receiver for carrying out the method of the invention (Figure 7 shows this version in more detail).

It is submitted that this application relates to only one specie.

In particular, Figures 1, 8 and 9 clearly relate to the same method, and therefore belong to the same species.

Figure 3 is simply an extension of Figure 2 with multiple branches in parallel and Figure 5 is simply an extension of Figure 4 with multiple branches in parallel. Thus, Figures 3 and 5 belong to the same species as Figures 2 and 4.

Figures 6 and 7 are simply more detailed explanations of Figure 4 and 5, and are thus not mutually exclusive of Figures 4 and 5. Thus, Figures 6 and 7 belong to the same species as Figures 2, 4, 3 and 5.

The method parts of the application (Figures 1, 8, 9) are, of course, linked to the apparatus parts (Figures 2-7) in the normal way, are not mutually exclusive, and therefore relate to the same species.

It is therefore submitted that all claims should remain in this application and be examined at present, and the Examiner's further action on the application is therefore awaited.

December 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr.

Registration No. 26,935

Barnes & Thornburg

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4800

(312) 759-5646 (fax)